

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/785,133	GALLANT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RUTH C. RODRIGUEZ	3677	

All Participants:

(1) RUTH C. RODRIGUEZ, PTO.

(2) BRETT A. KRUEGER, Applicant's Representative.

Date of Interview: 10 October 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Of record

Claims discussed:

75

Prior art documents discussed:

Of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) JAMES BABINEAU, Applicant's Representative.

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Mr. Krueger to propose an Examiner's Amendment for claim 75. Mr. Krueger called Mr. Babineau who also participated in the interview. The Examiner indicated that the term "overhand" in the eighth line must be changed to --overhang--. The Examiner also indicated that the references of Lauer and Burnett et al. still could be used to reject the claims because the claim only recites the intended use limitation "for receiving an upper edge of a mating fastener element" but the claims does not recite that the mating fastener has to be an identical mating fastener and therefore any fastener or object that can be received in the wells will meet the claim limitation. The Examiner indicated that the limitation "the engageable sides of the majority of the elements are oriented in a common direction and overhang the sheet-form base" could make the claim allowable if criticality of the overhang is included in the claim since Lauer and Burnett fail to disclose an overhang. After some discussion, Mr. Babineau proposed adding the limitation "to resist separation of a mating fastener element" as a way to make more clear the intended purpose of the overhang of the engageable side. Both parties agreed with this change and the Examiner agreed to make this change through an Examiner's amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance.